29. (New) A roller skate carriage as claimed in Claim 27, wherein the torsion spring is a coil spring in torsion.

30. (New) A roller skate carriage as claimed in Claim 1, wherein the torsion spring is a helical coil spring.

31. (New) A roller skate carriage as claimed in Claim 27, in which the path of movement of a wheel upon displacement of the suspension is non-linear.

32. (New) A roller skate carriage as claimed in Claim 27, in which the path of the suspension travel of a wheel varies in direction with a variation in the magnitude of the excursion from a static load position.

33. (New) A roller skate carriage as claimed in Claim 27, in which the wheels are arranged in-line with one another along the body of the carriage in a single line.

34. (New) A roller skate carriage as claimed in Claim 27, in which the resilient suspension of each wheel thereof is substantially undamped.

35. (New) A roller skate carriage as claimed in Claim 27, in which the suspension travel of a wheel is inclined towards the rear carriage.

36. (New) A roller skate carriage as claimed in Claim 27, in which the wheels are carried by respective pivoted trailing arms mounted for rotation about

respective axes pivotally substantially parallel to the axis of rotation of the wheel carried thereby.

37. (New) A roller skate as claimed in Claim 36, in which each said pivoted trailing arms houses a respective torsion spring urging the arm to turn in a first direction about its first axis with respect to the carriage body.

38. (New) A roller skate carriage as claimed in Claim 27, in which the resilient force acting on each wheel is independently adjustable by respective adjustment means.

39. (New) A roller skate carriage as claimed in Claim 38, in which the adjustment of the resilient suspension force is effected by adjustment of the angular position of a locating member held in place by frictional engagement with a fixed part of the carriage or a member carried thereby.

40. (New) A roller skate carriage as claimed in Claim 27, in which there are provided abutment stops on the body of the carriage, engaged by a movable part of the suspension whereby to determine the maximum extension travel of a wheel suspension.

41. (New) A roller skate carriage as claimed in Claim 40, in which the said abutment stops are adjustable whereby to adjust the said maximum extension position of a wheel.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 112

Claims 9-14, 22 and 25 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as containing matter not enabled by the specification.

Applicant respectfully submits that the above rejection is moot, as these claims have been canceled, without prejudice, in the instant application. Moreover, it is Applicant's position that the newly submitted claims, taken with the above discussion with respect to the drawings, are fully supported by the instant specification.

In further detail, with respect to claim 22, the Examiner is directed to lines 8-23 at page 12 of the specification, along with Figs. 2 and 6, wherein the adjustable abutment stops are provided by threaded stop screws (44) which pass through respective threaded openings in lugs (45) so that the arms (26) can be adjusted to an appropriate rearward inclination by turning the head (46) of the screws (44) by means of a suitable key (not shown).

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims as lacking enablement under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Claims 3, 4, 6-9, 16, 20-22 and 26 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. With respect to the language of canceled claim 3 (new claim 32), the term "varies in direction with a variation in the magnitude of the excursion from a static load position" refers to the non-linearity of the path of movement of the wheel upon displacement of the suspension and to the fact that the angular orientation of the wheel with respect to the pivot axis of the trailing arm varies with the magnitude of the displacement of the wheel and

trailing arm from a static load position, that is to say, the position adopted by the wheel and trailing arm when subject to static loads due to the weight of the user only.

With respect to canceled claim 4 (new claim 27), the Examiner's reading of the limitation "in which said constraining means comprise one or more trailing arm for respectively carrying each wheel" is correct. That is, each wheel has its own at least one trailing arm. Applicant respectfully submits that this language is clear as written, and therefore, requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of this claim language.

With respect to canceled claims 6 and 7, while not acquiescing to the merits of the rejection, these features to not appear in the presently pending claims. As this rejection is moot, withdrawal is respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 16, the term "substantially undamped" means that no separate damping elements are provided in the suspension, although the suspension may be subject to, for example, frictional damping due to motion of the spring members and other moveable elements of the suspension. Applicant respectfully submits that this language is clear as written, and therefore, requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of this claim language.

With respect to claim 20, the Examiner is directed to the description at page 11, lines 10-20 and page 11, line 25 to page 12, line 6, where it is stated that the locating member is provided by the disc (41) which is clamped securely by friction against the flange (14). The flange (14) comprises a fixed part of the carriage in the embodiment disclosed, although it would be possible for frictional engagement to take place with an additional member carried by the carriage and located between the carriage and the disc (41).

With respect to claims 21 and 22, Applicant respectfully submits that an explanation for "abutment stops" has been adequately established earlier in this response. The abutment stops are provided by the end blocks (47) mounted on the adjustable threads (44) and not the abutment blocks (48) which are fixed in position relative to the flange (14) of the carriage.

Finally, with respect to claim 26, Applicant agrees that the originally filed claim language may be found as confusing. This claim language is now presented in new claim 43 as "a carriage ... fixed to a boot for receiving and supporting the foot of a user". Applicant respectfully submits that this claim language is clear and unambiguous and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the instant rejection.

For the reasons above, Applicant respectfully submits that the newly submitted claims are free from rejections under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 1-6, 15-17, 19-24 and 26 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Burns *et al.* (US 5,823,543).

To overcome a rejection of a claim for anticipation it is only necessary to show that a claim contains at least one element not disclosed in the prior art. The claims are presented to include the limitation of a resilient suspension in which the resilient action of the suspension is provided by a torsion spring acting about the pivot axis of the trailing arm. This limitation is not taught or fairly suggested by the roller skate shock absorber system of Burns. Accordingly, since it is

shown that the claims contain at least one element not disclosed in the prior art reference, it is respectfully proposed that the rejection for anticipation has been overcome. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 7-14 and 25 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burns *et al.*

Without acquiescing to the merits of the rejections under 35 USC 103(a) as noted in the previous office action, Applicant has presented a new set of claims deemed allowable over the prior art of record. As noted above, the claims are presented to include the limitation of a resilient suspension in which the resilient action of the suspension is provided by a torsion spring acting about the pivot axis of the trailing arm. This limitation is neither taught nor fairly suggested by the roller skate shock absorber system of Burns.

There is no teaching or fair suggestion, absent impermissible hindsight, to modify the actual teachings of Burns to arrive at the instant invention. The significance of the use of torsion springs lies in the fact that a torsion spring is capable of adjustment around the rorsion axis so that the restoring force applied by the spring can be adjusted for a given (rest) position of the suspension arm. This, therefore, makes it possible to adjust the position of the suspension arm about its pivot axis to any selected orientation, and quickly and simply adjust the restoring force exerted by the torsion spring by varying its torsional pre-load. This clearly differs from the teachings in Burns, wherein only limited adjustment of hte electronic members (106) is possible.